



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/625,047	07/24/2000	Yasushi Tokumo	019519-259	6633

21839 7590 09/10/2003

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

KARLSEN, ERNEST F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2829

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/625,047

Applicant(s)

TOKUMO ET AL.

Examiner

Ernest F. Karlson

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-8 and 10-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2829

1. Claims 5-8 and 10-19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions and/or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 13.

2. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al in view of Luther.

Ozawa et al show, in Figure 17, the structure of that claimed except for the feature of a plurality of protuberances and a plurality of recesses formed in the tip end. Luther shows in Figure 3 a plurality of tips 31 having pyramid shape to enable better contact. Note that where these are protuberances these are recesses between the protuberances. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have adapted the tips of Luther to the end of the probe of Ozawa et al because one of ordinary skill in the art would realize that so doing would enable more reliable contact to be made.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al in view of Luther and Grabbe.

Ozawa and Luther were discussed above but the combination does not include the feature of the bulging sections having different rigidity enabling better contact to be made. Grabbe shows

Art Unit: 2829

sections with different rigidity. See Figure 3 and related text of Grabbe. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have adapted the tips of Luther to the end of the probe of Ozawa et al and to have adapted the different rigidity feature of Grabbe to the apparatus resulting from the combination of Ozawa et al and Luther because one skilled in the art would realized that so doing would result in more reliable contact.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Stowers and Farnworth et al are cited to show additional probe apparatus with a plurality of protuberances and a plurality of recesses formed in the tip end of a probe.

E KARLSEN/pj

08/27/03


ERNEST KARLSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER